

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LOOP AI LABS INC,
Plaintiff,
v.
ANNA GATTI, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 15-cv-00798-HSG

ORDER RE: FEES ON FEES

Re: Dkt. Nos. 660, 678, 681

On May 9, 2016, the Court awarded Plaintiff attorneys' fees for Plaintiff's successful motion to strike IQ System, Inc.'s anti-SLAPP motion. Dkt. No. 660. In that order the Court also awarded Plaintiff fees incurred with respect to enforcing its right to fees under § 425.16, *id.* See also *Ketchum v. Moses*, 24 Cal.4th 1122, 1141 (2001). The Court directed Plaintiff to submit billing records indicating the number of hours expended on the motion for fees.

On May 13, 2016, Plaintiff filed an administrative motion to file under seal an unredacted copy of the invoice identifying the time entries and nature of services for the work performed on the fees' motion, Dkt. No. 681. For the reasons identified in the Court's May 6, 2016 order, Dkt. No. 646, the Court GRANTS the motion to file the invoice under seal, Dkt. No. 681.

On May 13, 2016, Plaintiff also filed a declaration in support of its motion for fees on fees, identifying the time entries and work performed on the fees' motion. Dkt. No. 678. Plaintiff request \$9,379 for work performed on the opening brief. *Id.* at 2. The opening brief was filed on October 9, 2015, Dkt. No. 258, and according to Plaintiff, the green entries on the invoice reflect the work performed on the opening brief. Dkt. No. 678 at 2. Several of the green entries, however, were for work performed after the date the opening brief was filed. Because the hours expended after October 9 could not have been for work performed on the opening brief, the Court deducts \$950.00 from the total. Having found the remaining time entries reasonable in light of the


1 nature of the motion, the Court awards \$8,429 for work performed on the opening brief.

2 Plaintiff requests \$8,167 for work performed on the reply brief, which was filed on
3 October 30, 2015. The yellow entries on the invoice reflect hours expended on the reply brief, and
4 the Court finds that the work performed on the reply brief reasonable in light of the work needed.
5 Accordingly, the Court awards the full requested amount for the hours expended on the reply
6 brief.

7 For the reasons described here, as well as in the Court's May 9, 2016 order, the Court
8 awards Plaintiff \$16,596 for the fees on fees' request.

9 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

10 Dated: 5 / 24 / 2016

11
12 
13 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
14 United States District Judge
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

United States District Court
Northern District of California